


REMARKS

In the Office Action dated January 10, 2006, the Examiner has restricted the claims to two groups: Claims 1-12 and 27-36 form Group I. Claims 13-26 form Group II. Both Claims 1 and 13 are similar in that they both recite using active and passive wheel lift detection. Claim 1 is broader in the sense that a final wheel lift signal is generated in response to the passive wheel lift signal and the active wheel lift signal. Claim 13 recites preventing the vehicle from rolling over in response to the active wheel lift signal and the passive wheel lift signal. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the restriction requirement since the use of determining wheel lift in Claim 1 is a likely use for the system. Therefore, any search for this device should include Class 701, Subclass 124. Therefore, no additional burden is placed upon the examining corps. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the grouping of the claims and respectfully requests the examination of Groups I and II.

In the event the restriction requirement is not withdrawn, Applicant hereby elects Claims 1-12 and 27-36 in Group I without traverse.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Kevin G. Mierzwa, Reg. No. 38,049
Attorney for Applicants

Date: 2/9/06

Artz & Artz, PC
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500